IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

Leslie E. Kobayashi United States District Judge

GENERAL FEDERAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS IN CRIMINAL CASES

INDEX

1		DUTY OF JUDGE					
	A	Before Closing Arguments					
	В	After Closing Arguments					
2		DUTY TO FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS					
	A	Single Defendant					
	В	Multiple Defendants					
3		REASONABLE DOUBT					
4		DEFENDANT'S DECISION NOT TO TESTIFY					
5		EVIDENCE EXCLUDING ARGUMENT OF COUNSEL					
6		EVIDENCE OBJECTIONS					
7		EVIDENCE EXCLUDING STATEMENTS OF JUDGE					
8		EVIDENCE STIPULATIONS					
9		EVIDENCE DIRECT AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL					
10		EVIDENCE CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES					
11		EVIDENCE EXPERT WITNESSES					
12		IMPEACHMENT GENERALLY					
13		IMPEACHMENT REPUTATION FOR TRUTHFULNESS					
14		IMPEACHMENT PRIOR CONVICTION					
15		IMPEACHMENT OF DEFENDANT					
	A	General Instruction					
	В	General Instruction & Prior Conviction					
		(To be read, in addition to #12 above,					
wher	า						
		defendant is impeached by prior					
conv	victi	on)					
16		ON OR ABOUT					
17		KNOWINGLY					
18		CAUTION PUNISHMENT					
	A	Single Defendant, Single Count in					
Ind	ictme	nt					
	В	Single Defendant, Multiple Counts in					

Indictment

	С	Multiple Defendants, Single Count				
	D	Multiple Defendants, Multiple Counts				
19		TAKING NOTES DURING TRIAL				
20		DUTY TO DELIBERATE				
21		VERDICT FORMS				
	A	Verdict Form Single Defendant				
	В	Verdict Forms Multiple Defendants				

Members of the Jury:

You have now heard all of the evidence in the case and will soon hear the final arguments of the lawyers for the parties.

It becomes my duty, therefore, to instruct you on the rules of law that you must follow and apply in arriving at your decision in the case.

In any jury trial there are, in effect, two judges. I am one of the judges; the other is the jury. It has been my duty to preside over the trial and to determine what testimony and evidence is relevant under the law for your consideration. It is now my duty to instruct you on the law applicable to the case.

Members of the Jury:

You have now heard all of the evidence in the case as well as the final arguments of the lawyers for the parties.

It becomes my duty, therefore, to instruct you on the rules of law that you must follow and apply in arriving at your decision in the case.

In any jury trial there are, in effect, two judges. I am one of the judges; the other is the jury. It has been my duty to preside over the trial and to determine what testimony and evidence is relevant under the law for your consideration. It is now my duty to instruct you on the law applicable to the case.

You, as jurors, are the judges of the facts.

But in determining what happened in this case -- that is, in reaching your decision as to the facts -- it is your sworn duty to follow the law I am now defining for you.

You must follow all of my instructions as a whole. You have no right to disregard or give special attention to any one instruction, or to question the wisdom or correctness of any rule I state to you. That is, you must not substitute or follow your own notion or opinion as to what the law is or ought to be. It is your duty to apply the law as I give it to you, regardless of the consequences.

It is also your duty to base your verdict solely upon the testimony and evidence in the case, without prejudice or sympathy. That was the promise you made and the oath you took before being accepted by the parties as jurors in this case, and they have the right to expect nothing less.

You, as jurors, are the judges of the facts.

But in determining what happened in this case -- that is, in reaching your decision as to the facts -- it is your sworn duty to follow the law I am now defining for you. Unless otherwise stated, you should consider each instruction to apply separately and individually to each defendant on trial.

You must follow all of my instructions as a whole. You have no right to disregard or give special attention to any one instruction, or to question the wisdom or correctness of any rule I state to you. That is, you must not substitute or follow your own notion or opinion as to what the law is or ought to be. It is your duty to apply the law as I give it to you, regardless of the consequences.

It is also your duty to base your verdict solely upon the testimony and evidence in the case, without prejudice or sympathy. That was the promise you made and the oath you took before being accepted by

the parties as jurors in this case, and they have the right to expect nothing less.

The indictment or formal charge against a defendant is not evidence. The defendant is presumed to be innocent and does not have to present any evidence to prove innocence. The government has the burden of proving every element of the charge beyond a reasonable doubt. If it fails to do so, you must return a not guilty verdict.

While the government's burden of proof is a strict or heavy burden, it is not necessary that the defendant's guilt be proved beyond all possible doubt. It is only required that the government's proof exclude any "reasonable doubt" concerning the defendant's guilt.

A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason and common sense, and may arise from a careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence, or from lack of evidence. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced that the defendant is guilty.

If after a careful and impartial consideration with your fellow jurors of all the evidence, you are not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, it is your duty to find the defendant not guilty. On the other hand, if after a careful and impartial consideration with your fellow jurors of all the evidence, you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, it is your duty to find the defendant guilty.

The law does not compel a defendant in a criminal case to testify. No presumption of guilt may be raised, and no inference of any kind may be drawn, from the fact that the defendant did not testify.

As stated earlier, it is your duty to determine the facts, and in doing so, you must consider only the evidence I have admitted in the case. The term "evidence" includes the sworn testimony of the witnesses and the exhibits admitted in the record.

Remember that any statements, objections, or arguments made by the lawyers are not evidence in the case. The function of the lawyers is to point out those things that are most significant or most helpful to their side of the case, and in doing so, to call your attention to certain facts or inferences that might otherwise escape your notice.

In the final analysis, however, it is your own recollection and interpretation of the evidence that controls in the case. What the lawyers say is not binding upon you.

There are rules of evidence which control what can be received into evidence. During the course of trial, when a lawyer asked a question or offered an exhibit into evidence and a lawyer on the other side thought that it was not permitted by the rules of evidence, that lawyer may have objected. If I overruled an objection, the question was answered or the exhibit received. If I sustained an objection, the question was not answered and the exhibit was not received.

Whenever I sustained an objection to a question, you must not speculate as to what the answer might have been or as to the reason for the objection. You must not consider for any purpose any offer of evidence that was rejected, or any evidence that was stricken from the record; such matter is to be treated as though you had never known of it.

During the course of the trial I may have occasionally made comments to the lawyers, or asked questions of a witness, or admonished a witness concerning the manner in which he or she should respond to the questions of counsel. Do not assume from anything I said that I have any opinion concerning any of the issues in this case. Except for my instructions to you on the law, you should disregard anything I said during the trial in arriving at your own findings as to the facts.

In this case, the government and the defendant have agreed, or stipulated, as to certain facts. This means that they both agree that these facts are true. You should therefore treat these facts as having been conclusively proved.

Evidence may be direct or circumstantial.

Direct evidence is direct proof of a fact, such as the testimony of an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is indirect evidence, that is, proof of a chain of facts from which you could find that another fact exists, even though it has not been proved directly.

So, while you should consider only the evidence in the case, you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences from the testimony and exhibits as you feel are justified in the light of common experience. In other words, you may make deductions and reach conclusions which reason and common sense lead you to draw from the testimony and evidence in the case.

You are to consider both direct and circumstantial evidence. The law permits you to give equal weight to both, but it is for you to decide how much weight to give to any evidence.

Now, I have said that you must consider all of the evidence. This does not mean, however, that you must accept all of the evidence as true or accurate.

You are the sole judges of the credibility or "believability" of each witness and the weight to be given to his or her testimony. In evaluating the testimony of a witness, you may consider: (1) the opportunity and ability of the witness to see or hear or know the things testified to; (2) the witness' memory;

(3) the witness' manner while testifying; (4) the witness' interest in the outcome of the case and any bias or prejudice; (5) whether other evidence contradicted the witness' testimony; (6) the reasonableness of the witness' testimony in light of all the evidence; and (7) any other factors that bear on believability. You may accept or reject the testimony of any witness in whole or in part.

Also, the weight of the evidence is not necessarily determined by the number of witnesses

testifying as to the existence or non-existence of any fact. You may find that the testimony of a smaller number of witnesses as to any fact is more credible than the testimony of a larger number of witnesses to the contrary.

The rules of evidence provide that if scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge might assist the jury in understanding the evidence or in determining a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify and state his or her opinion concerning such matters.

You should consider each expert opinion received in evidence in this case and give it such weight as you may think it deserves. If you decide that the opinion of an expert witness is not based upon sufficient education and/or experience, or if you conclude that the reasons given in support of the opinion are not sound, or if you conclude that the opinion is outweighed by other evidence, then you may disregard the opinion entirely.

A witness may be discredited or "impeached" by contradictory evidence by a showing that: (1) the witness testified falsely concerning a material matter; or (2) at some other time, the witness said or did something that is inconsistent with the witness' present testimony; or (3) at some other time, the witness failed to say or do something that would be consistent with the present testimony had it been said or done.

If you believe that any witness has been so impeached, then it is for you alone to decide how much credibility or weight, if any, to give to the testimony of that witness.

A witness may also be discredited or impeached by evidence that the general reputation of the witness for truth and veracity is bad in the community where the witness now resides, or has recently resided.

If you believe that any witness has been so impeached, then it is for you alone to decide how much credibility or weight, if any, to give to the testimony of that witness.

The fact that a witness has previously been convicted of a felony, or a crime involving dishonesty or false statement, is also a factor you may consider in weighing the credibility of that witness. The fact of such a conviction does not necessarily destroy the witness' credibility, but is one of the circumstances you may take into account in determining the weight to give to the testimony.

As stated earlier, a defendant has a right not to testify. If a defendant testified, however, that defendant's testimony should be weighed and considered, and credibility determined, in the same way as that of any other witness.

As stated earlier, a defendant has a right not to testify. If a defendant testified, however, that defendant's testimony should be weighed and considered, and credibility determined, in the same way as that of any other witness. Evidence of a defendant's previous conviction of a crime is to be considered by you only as it may affect the credibility of the defendant as a witness, and must never be considered as evidence of quilt of the crime for which the defendant is on trial.

You will note that the indictment charges that the offense was committed "on or about" a certain date. The evidence need not establish with certainty the exact date of the alleged offense. It is sufficient if the evidence in the case establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the offense was committed on a date reasonably near the date alleged.

The word "knowingly," as that term has been used in these instructions, means that the act was done voluntarily and intentionally and not because of mistake or accident.

I caution you, members of the jury, that you are here to determine whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty from the evidence in this case. The defendant is not on trial for any act or conduct or offense not alleged in the indictment. Nor are you called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of any other person or persons not on trial as a defendant in this case.

Also, the punishment provided by law for the offense charged in the indictment is a matter exclusively within the province of the judge, and should never be considered by the jury in any way in arriving at an impartial verdict.

A separate crime or offense is charged in each count of the indictment. Each charge and the evidence pertaining to it should be considered separately. The fact that you may find the defendant guilty or not guilty as to one of the offenses charged should not control your verdict as to any other offense charged.

I caution you, members of the jury, that you are here to determine whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty from the evidence in this case. The defendant is not on trial for any act or conduct or offense not alleged in the indictment. Nor are you called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of any other person or persons not on trial as a defendant in this case.

Also, the punishment provided by law for the offenses charged in the indictment is a matter exclusively within the province of the judge, and should never be considered by the jury in any way in arriving at an impartial verdict.

The case of each defendant and the evidence pertaining to each defendant should be considered by you separately and individually. The fact that you may find one of the defendants guilty or not guilty should not control your verdict as to any other defendant.

I caution you, members of the jury, that you are here to determine whether each of the defendants is guilty or not guilty from the evidence in this case. The defendants are not on trial for any act or conduct or offense not alleged in the indictment. Nor are you called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of any other person or persons not on trial as a defendant in this case.

Also, the punishment provided by law for the offense charged in the indictment is a matter exclusively within the province of the judge, and should never be considered by the jury in any way in arriving at an impartial verdict.

A separate crime or offense is charged against one or more of the defendants in each count of the indictment. Each offense, and the evidence pertaining to it, should be considered by you separately. Also, the case of each defendant should be considered by you separately and individually. The fact that you may find one of the defendants guilty or not guilty of any of the offenses charged should not control your verdict as to any other offense or any other defendant.

I caution you, members of the jury, that you are here to determine whether each of the defendants is guilty or not guilty from the evidence in this case.

The defendants are not on trial for any act or conduct or offense not alleged in the indictment. Nor are you called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt of any other person or persons not on trial as a defendant in this case.

Also, the punishment provided by law for the offenses charged in the indictment is a matter exclusively within the province of the judge, and

should never be considered by the jury in any way in arriving at an impartial verdict.

Some of you took notes during the trial.

Whether or not you took notes, you should rely on your own memory of what was said. Notes are only to assist your memory. You should not be overly influenced by your notes.

Your verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. In order to return a verdict, it is necessary that each juror agree thereto. In other words, your verdict must be unanimous.

It is your duty as jurors to consult with one another, and to deliberate in an effort to reach agreement if you can do so without violence to individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but only after an impartial consideration of the evidence in the case with your fellow jurors. In the course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if convinced it is erroneous. But do not surrender your honest conviction as to the weight or effect of the evidence solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors, or for the mere purpose of returning a verdict.

Remember at all times, you are not partisans.

You are judges -- judges of the facts. Your sole
interest is to seek the truth from the evidence in the case.

Upon retiring to the jury room you should first select one of your number to act as your foreperson who will preside over your deliberations and will be your spokesperson here in court. A verdict form has been prepared for your convenience.

(Explain Verdict Form)

You will take the verdict form to the jury room and when you have reached unanimous agreement as to your verdict, you will have your foreperson fill it in, date and sign it, and then return to the courtroom.

If, during your deliberations, you desire to communicate with the court, please put your message or question in a note, have the foreperson sign the note, and pass the note to the marshal who will bring it to my attention. I will then respond as promptly as possible, either in writing or by having you return to the courtroom so that I can address you orally. I caution you, however, that you should never state or specify your numerical division at any time. For example, you should never state that "x" number of

jurors are leaning or voting one way and "x" number of jurors are leaning or voting another way.

Upon retiring to the jury room you should first select one juror to act as your foreperson who will preside over your deliberations and will be your spokesperson here in court. Verdict forms have been prepared for your convenience.

(Explain Verdict Forms)

You will take the verdict forms to the jury room and when you have reached unanimous agreement as to your verdicts, you will have your foreperson fill them in, date and sign them, and then return to the courtroom.

If, during your deliberations, you desire to communicate with the court, please put your message or question in a note, have the foreperson sign the note, and pass the note to the marshal who will bring it to my attention. I will then respond as promptly as possible, either in writing or by having you return to the courtroom so that I can address you orally. I caution you, however, that you should never state or specify your numerical division at any time. For

example, you should never state that "x" number of jurors are leaning or voting one way and "x" number of jurors are leaning or voting another way.